- Intro
-- Says I'm not homophobic but insinuates that I could be, TWICE,
in both title and intro statements. Wonderful.

- First interjection is a LEAP, rape is NOT at all comparible to
denying service to a couple, because on one hand you're just NOT
selling something to people, and the other is PHYSICALLY ASSAULTING
them.

- I don't get the second interjection, are you trying to insinuate that it's not
needed or relevant? Because... sure? I guess? Whatever.

- Third interjection is just WRONG.
-- Philosopossum even within his video explains that the bakery wasn't
explicitly discriminating against the gay couple and denying them service,
they would have been willing to sell another item in their store, they just
didn't want to make a gay wedding cake.

- "Skip 24:55 - 25:18"
-- You literally cut out where I explicitly DON'T support said discrimination
but instead explain to Blaze that it IS legal for the private business to
turn down the request for a gay wedding cake.

- "What's the difference between a gay wedding cake and a straight one"
Simple, one was being commissioned, if it's really NOT that big of a deal
then the bakery is STILL in the right because the gay couple could just
BUY a normal wedding cake, what's the big deal then Koda? Obviously the
bakery doesn't sell cakes that are explicitly for gay weddings, if you have to
commission it, then they don't normally sell it.

- "the item doesn't change because a gay person has it"
Then why was it being commissioned? This whole conversation falls apart
the moment this question even gets asked.

- "that's the definition of discrimination, suzy, good job"
-- Before playing the rest of my point that completely renders your previous
point null.

- "stop using this fluffy language, it's the same thing"
-- No, it's NOT. On the one hand, you're outright denying service to someone
outright, on the other hand, you're just... drawing a boundary on a commission.
Actually, on that note, should artists be required to draw porn or furries if
they do not want or feel comfortable in doing so? Can artists never set rules
on the things that they create? The Colorado bakery in question was WILLING

to sell the couple anything else that they wanted, just not create something that went against their religious beliefs.

- "I'm not a white supremacist, I'm a race realist"
...ALSO not comparable. For a similar reason the rape comparison doesn't, actually.

- "Politically illiterate people"
Totally not condescending at all. Also... question Koda... WHEN did I ever say I wasn't politically literate? I say I don't like politics, I say that I'm not ready to get political IN the video, sure, but like... I also say in the commentary that I was an ANTI-SJW who defended GamerGate, PLUS my Windu Stackhouse video exists, which WAS a politically based video. Politics aren't new to me, they're just not something I LIKE to talk about, you being a condescending bitch about this is misdirected, to put it nicely.

- the football comparison is now 3 for 3 on "ones that don't work", 1) because touch football exists, flag football exists, there are ways to play football without tackling each other... but MORE IMPORTANTLY, even if those didn't exist, bakeries don't NEED to specifically make cakes for specific messages or events. Hell, some bakeries don't do cakes at ALL, anecdotally speaking, there was a bakery nearby where I live that only sold bread, bagels, baguettes, and other bready-related items, it's once again, better comparable to an artist. Like, a digital artist doesn't draw traditionally, put it that way. But considering we're talking about one that does... once again, bakeries should be allowed to decline a message or an event. The bakery in Colorado that was being talked about, also didn't make Halloween cakes either, should they be forced to do that too? Is that discrimination against Halloween?

- "gay wedding cakes are just cakes"
...that are specifically commissioned for gay weddings, correct.

- "I don't do gay car repairs"
4 for 4 on "doesn't fucking work" - man, you are REALLY bad at this Koda, a car repairman isn't COMISSIONED to do a special car repair based on sexual orientation, like, GEE Koda, I WONDER why this argument wouldn't WORK in that situation, almost as if it's NOT APPLICABLE.

- "Man, I really like this furry artists work but they won't draw my human OC, god, how discriminatory of them! Every artist needs to be open to draw EVERYTHING." "Wait what do you mean this BURGER KING isn't gonna sell me a Big Mac?! Man... this is discriminatory against clowns! It's only a burger!" By the way, on the note on specifically Masterpiece Cakeshop. "Elegant Bakery" is literally a 5 minute drive from where Masterpiece Cakeshop is and has been there since roughly 2012,

before M.C. had it's controversy

- "Oh so you admit it's the people behind it."
Omg, nobody can be this dense. No, it's the event that's the problem, if the GAY COUPLE WANTED SOMETHING ELSE, THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN SOLD SOMETHING ELSE.

- "The difference is who they're selling it to"
AAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAA

- "Not to mention doing it poorly"
Shame you haven't debunked ANYTHING talked about thus far, but go off.

- "if a baker refuses service to the customer, they may have to change plans for their wedding,"
No they wouldn't, they could still have the wedding as pleased, they just get the cake elsewhere. Nothing changes, they could still get married. Bleh.

-"they may need to spend more money which they may not have"
Not if they're not SOLD the cake, they don't??? Koda, did you forget that your argument is built on the foundation that the couple wasn't being sold the cake?

-"they may need to do extra driving which they may not be able to do."
In this particular scenario, they can fucking walk.

- "they can get more customers and not having one customer isn’t gonna kill their business."
Sure? But that doesn't argue what Philosopossum was arguing, there, he was talking about how if we take away the free market, then the companies should be able to FORCE people to shop there, so basically if a company CANNOT deny service, then the customers CANNOT deny patronage. That's his argument.

- "it’s merely a way to continue to treat gay people as social outcasts."
Okay... I GET where this is coming from, but like... this is a slippery slope and you know it. Plus, there's laws in place against these other forms of discrimination you allude to, won't hire? Prohibited Employment Policies/Practice laws. Won't rent a place to live? The Fair Housing Act. Parent disowning their child? Laws in place for it. Actually, there are legal ways to disown a child, it's SAD, but like... you can. THAT SAID, if you choose to not go through with it legally, child abandonment laws.

- "what about companies that can swallow the cost"
What ABOUT those? It doesn't change that if enough people stop going to one place, your "what about (x) what about (y)" points seriously are getting annoying

because they haven't been working, and you're WAY too over-reliant on these hypotheticals making your points for you.

- Activision Blizzard
"Cancel Culture isn't real", "cyberbullying isn't real" bladah, bladah. You get the gist. In any case, Blizzard bled money until Microsoft bought them in January, otherwise, they probably WOULD have. In any case, I can make examples of "big companies" that failed. Sure, the ones I could bring up weren't about explicitly discriminatory practices, but they still prove my notion accurate, remember Sears? Remember Blockbuster? Remember Toys R Us? I doooooooooo.

"I know you can get in contact with me, ottomagic critic, and EphromJosine, all people who know more about politics and are more experienced in it."
...Given your video on Omnia, and the script I'm seeing here, I think I'll take my chances doing my own research thank you.